REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 18, 2007.
Claims 1-33 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 1 and 12,
cancels claims 8-11 and 19-33, and adds new claims 34-39, leaving pending in the application
claims 1-7, 12-18, and 34-39. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-33

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over
Cotner et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,055, hereinafter "Cotner") in view of Vosseler (U.S.
Publication No. 2003/0126240, hereinafter "Vosseler"). Applicants respectfully submit that
Cotner and Vosseler, considered individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the
features of these claims.

Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A method for processing databases in a system which includes a plurality of
> storage areas each storing a database and a plurality of computers each having a database
> management program (DBMS) running thereon which manages one of said plurality of storage
> areas, each said storage area being associated with only said DBMS managing said storage area
> and being accessed by only said DBMS, said method comprising:
>
> when a failure has occurred in one of said plurality of computers as a failed
> computer, obtaining preset substitution information indicating that a storage area managed by a
> DBMS running on said failed computer is to be managed and accessed by a DBMS already
> running on another one of said plurality of computers as a substitute DBMS; and
>
> based on said substitution information, changing association of said storage area
> with said DBMS on said failed computer to said substitute DBMS, said storage area to be
> managed by said substitute DBMS already running on said another computer.
>
> (Applicants' claim 1, as amended, emphasis added).

At least the above features are not taught or suggested by Cotner and/or Vosseler.

For example, the combination of Cotner and Vosseler does not teach or suggest
"obtaining preset substitution information indicating that a storage area managed by a DBMS
running on said failed computer is to be managed and accessed by a DBMS already running on
another one of said plurality of computers as a substitute DBMS" as recited in claim 1. In the

Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the above feature is disclosed in Cotner at Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 60-67, and col. 3, lines 1-9. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Cotner is directed to a system and method for "resyncing" a client computer with a single database server that has failed and then resumed operation. (Cotner: Abstract). In the system of Cotner, each database server (*i.e.*, DBMS) is associated with a "resynchronization port number" and a TCP/IP address. (Cotner: col. 4, lines 60-62). The resynchronization port number is an identifier that uniquely identifies the DBMS. (Cotner: col. 6, lines 62-65). The TCP/IP address corresponds to the network address of the computer system on which the DBMS is currently running.

As described in the sections cited by the Examiner, a client interacting with a specific DBMS may occasionally need to resynchronize with that DBMS after the DBMS has failed and is restarted. (Cotner: col. 2, lines 60-63). However, the DBMS may be restarted on a different host computer with a different network address (*i.e.*, TCP/IP address) than the one used prior to the failure. As a result, the client may not know how to reestablish communication with the restarted DBMS to carry out the resynchronization process. (Cotner: col. 3, lines 1-9). To address this, Cotner describes maintaining a global list of mappings between active resynchronization port numbers and TCP/IP addresses. Using this list, a client can determine the most up-to-date network address for a given DBMS based on its unique resynchronization port number. (Cotner: col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 9).

Thus, at best, Cotner discloses a list of mappings wherein each mapping includes attributes (*e.g.*, resynchronization port number and TCP/IP address) pertaining to a single DBMS. In contrast, claim 1 specifically recites obtaining substitution information indicating that a storage area managed by a DBMS running on a failed computer is to be managed and accessed by a DBMS already running on another computer as a substitute DBMS. In other words, the substitution information of claim 1 corresponds to mappings between different DBMSs (*e.g.*, the failed DBMS and the substitute DBMS). In this manner, a first DBMS may take on the processing of a second DBMS (or vice versa) in the case that one DBMS fails. Accordingly, Cotner fails to teach or suggest "obtaining preset substitution information indicating that a storage area managed by a DBMS running on said failed computer is to be managed and

Appl. No. 10/769,351
Amdt. dated November 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2007

PATENT

accessed by a DBMS already running on another one of said plurality of computers as a substitute DBMS" as recited in claim 1.

Further, Cotner does not teach or suggest "changing association of said storage area with said DBMS on said failed computer to said substitute DBMS" as recited in claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Cotner teaches this feature at col. 4, lines 60-67 and col. 5, lines 1-9. However, the cited sections simply describe the technique of using mappings between resynchronization port numbers and TCP/IP addresses to resynchronize a client with a given DBMS as described above. The cited sections make no reference to the concept of maintaining an association between a storage area and a specific DBMS, let alone changing such an association from a failed DBMS to a substitute DBMS based on the recited substitution information of claim 1. Accordingly, Cotner necessarily fails to teach or suggest "changing association of said storage area with said DBMS on said failed computer to said substitute DBMS" as recited in claim 1.

The deficiencies of Cotner are not remedied by Vosseler. Vosseler is directed to techniques for monitoring objects in an IT network. (Vosseler: Abstract). At paragraph 32, Vosseler briefly mentions the general concept of performing failover between clusters in a cluster-based operating system. However, Vosseler does not make any reference (and the Examiner provides no citation) to the specific concepts of "obtaining preset substitution information indicating that a storage area managed by a DBMS running on said failed computer is to be managed and accessed by a DBMS already running on another one of said plurality of computers as a substitute DBMS" or "changing association of said storage area with said DBMS on said failed computer to said substitute DBMS" as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, even if Cotner and Vosseler were combined (although there appears to be no rationale for combining), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest the various features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Cotner and/or Vosseler, and request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 12 recites features that are substantially similar to claim 1. Thus, claim 12 is believed to be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, and others.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 13-18 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claims 1 and 12, and are thus believed to be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1 and 12, and others.

Newly Presented Claims 34-39

Claims 34-39 have been added to cover different aspects of the present invention. These claims are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

Amendments to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Lee/

Andrew J. Lee
Reg. No. 60,371

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 / Fax: 415-576-0300
AJL:mg
61125628 v1